

**STAFFORD COUNTY  
AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT  
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES  
November 22, 2010**

The meeting of the Stafford County Agricultural and Purchase of Development Rights Committee for Monday, November 22, 2010, was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairman Tom Coen in the County Administration Conference Room of the County Administration Building.

Members Present: Coen, Adams, Clark, McClevey and O'Hara

Members Absent: Hunt

Staff Present: Baker, Neuhard, and Hamock

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Coen: We should get started. Please call the roll.

Ms. Hamock: You have five members present.

**2. Approval of Minutes – October 25, 2010**

Mr. Coen: First item is the approval of the October minutes. Is there a motion to approve them and then we can discuss them? Motion?

Mrs. Clark: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Is there a second?

Mr. Adams: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Alright, any discussion on the October 25, 2010 meeting minutes? Seeing none, we will put it to a vote. All those in favor of accepting the October 25th meeting minutes say aye.

Mr. Adams: Aye.

Mrs. Clark: Aye.

Mr. McClevey: Aye.

O'Hara: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright, we have taken care of that agenda item so now we move to staff update.

**3. Staff Update**

**• Rollback Taxes for PDR Funding**

Mr. Neuhard: The roll back taxes, I forwarded to the Board your position paper and your resolution last week prior to the meeting in which they were going to discuss legislative matters. They then had a brief discussion on legislative matters, then moved the discussion to the November 30th meeting. On the legislative agenda right now there remains the two additional years for rollback. We will see how they handle that when they discuss it. Paul has got the ball now and he made the point that he wanted to discuss that during the meeting last time. I asked the Chairman if they needed anybody from the PDR committee to come in and as of the other day they didn't. So that is where we are going to stand. If questions come up, which I think your position paper and resolution seem quite clear, my intention is to go forth and answer their questions directly from the position paper and what is recited in there is what I am going to be repeating should certain questions come up.

Mr. Adams: Is the 30th when they are doing that Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Neuhard: No, the Comprehensive Plan public hearing is on December 14th.

Mr. Adams: December 14th?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes. For some reason I thought I saw something on November 30th.

Mr. Neuhard: No.

Mr. Coen: Is the legislative part during the day?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes it is. It is on the work session in the afternoon.

Mr. Coen: Okay. How far into the... When you find out let me know.

Mr. Neuhard: Right now it is the last or next to last item so it will probably be, well it depends on how fast they go, but it will probably be discussed, I can double check, at 2:00 or 2:30ish at the earliest.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Neuhard: I will double check it.

Mr. Coen: Let me know, I can always swing by.

Mr. Adams: I was going to say, I am on the farm and I can always just be there. I don't have to take time off to be there.

Mr. Coen: Right. Well we are done by 2:15. I will just miss choir practice but I can just be there for moral support if nothing else. Cool. Okay, thank you. Any other discussion on the rollback? So I guess we will roll forward to unfinished business.

#### **4. Unfinished Business**

##### **• Ranking Criteria**

Mr. Coen: Rankings.

Mrs. Baker: Anyone need the latest printout?

Mr. Adams: I do.

Mrs. Baker: Well the one thing I wanted to tell you on the historical piece, you all are waiting on information from the Historical Commission. They have not had a quorum in three months so they have not had a chance to offer input on the historical resources piece. I am not sure if you want to wait and give them one more month to have a quorum or if you just want to keep things as they are? We can work with what is listed here but that is up to you all on how you want to handle historical resources.

Mr. Coen: Has Anita looked at it in any way?

Mrs. Baker: They have all looked at it, I already sent all the information to them.

Mr. Coen: And they haven't given any piecemealed individual reaction?

Mrs. Baker: They just sent back information which talks about the way they look at things being on a property and the National Historic register, state register, county historic district. As I have mentioned before we have a database with a whole lot of properties that are really fifty (50) years or older and certainly that is what we have looked at when we did the first round of ranking. There may be some gray area with the three pieces that we have here as we've talked about but we can certainly fit a clearer definition. Like if the property contains or is contiguous to important historic structure to national state or local significance, maybe right there you would give the higher points for being on a national register or within a county historic district. That would give you your higher points because those properties have already been determined to be significant. Your second category would be properties associated with historic activity, maybe that is our database of other historic sites that we have in some way flagged but they are not

as high up as the registers or historic districts. The last piece is the part that Mr. McClevey has certainly touched on wanting to include some level of having that visual landscape associated with it.

Mrs. Clark: You said that last time you looked at properties that had been over fifty (50) years that they had been with that property. Where would you put them?

Mrs. Baker: They would fall in the middle category if they are not within one of our local districts.

Mrs. Clark: Right.

Mrs. Baker: Or the National Register district.

Mrs. Clark: Okay.

Mr. Adams: Kathy, how would mine fall with that slave cemetery, is there any idea?

Mrs. Baker: Well I think in this case it would probably fall within the second category. It is associated with important people.

Mrs. Clark: Is the slave cemetery on a register of any kind?

Mr. Adams: No, in our case before we did the last, what was it last year when we did this, the applicant submitted a plat. We had our property resurveyed and have both cemeteries shown on the plat. We have never bothered to... If it is somehow registered on something the county has but that...

Mrs. Baker: We have a separate cemetery database as well that has 350 to 400 cemeteries that have been documented by our cemetery committee. I guess that is a question whether you want a separate category for cemeteries.

Mr. Adams: No I mean in my case I am just asking this for ourselves.

Mr. Coen: On the first category where it says local significance, do you feel comfortable with that being... Or do we need more of a definition in there to make that clearer for staff? I mean I guess my question would be does that qualify, you know, the owner of the property says this is significant because this is an archaeological site, it is a gold mine and you are like no, it is more associated with a historic event. Do you feel comfortable enough to fight that battle when that stage comes or do you need more clarification?

Mrs. Baker: Well, to me, by making the distinction about the local district, national or the state that is going to take something like the goldmine site and bump that into the second category. You want a clearer distinction on what you are considering important with the national, state or local significance, which includes archaeological sites. You have historic districts at the county level that are archaeological sites. They have been designated by the Board of Supervisors through the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

Mr. Coen: Any discussion?

Mrs. Clark: Well Marty, I was just going to ask you, are you okay with the designation because you did a lot work with a lot of different verbiage and I didn't know if this would be...

Mr. McClevey: Well, we weren't able to establish any, as Tom would say, a way of looking at landscapes and assessing them for significance and so forth and at this point we just have to wait until that becomes clearer or we find a way of addressing that. I think this is about the best we can do.

Mrs. Baker: The only other piece of this is if you decide that you want some additional clarification, we can always make the recommendation that when we get the applications in we can forward the information to the Historical Commission and get them to do that if you want that as part of the process. It does not have to be a written part of the process but we can make that a part of the process.

Mr. Coen: I don't want to ignore the Historical Commission but if they are not having a quorum I don't want to delay things. To me I would lean towards, if we were all set to go on everything else, then I will say that we will just keep going. If it is one of the categories and there is still some work we want to do then we can give them another month, that would be my feeling.

Mr. Adams: Not that it matters but is there a reason they don't have a quorum? Are they just short?

Mrs. Baker: They are short membership right now. They do not have a full seven members and they are having difficulties with a

couple people showing up. One has indicated that they are overstretched. If you would like we could change the wording more strict to say that it would have to be within a national register state or local district if you want it to be clear cut. So when an applicant comes in they will know.

Mrs. Clark: Well, I think that the only reason to make that language more specific is to help staff to make that decision, which makes sense to me. The note that I made for the historic district piece was for staff.

Mr. Baker: How about we just reword the first one there and just, or we could even add in parenthesis, if that makes it easier just to say that the national, state and local district just for clarification.

Mrs. Clark: I just want to make it easier for you all.

Mr. Coen: Is it that we are taking out the words "contiguous to"?

Mrs. Baker: No, I think we can keep contiguous if you are right next to that property. In many instances we have historic overlays that fall onto the next property or a buffer areas that goes onto the next property for the very reason of having buffers and lower impact on your historic sites.

Mr. Coen: Okay, any other discussion of adding to the first category? So everybody is alright with that? Does anyone have any other questions on or does staff have anything else on any other elements?

Mrs. Baker: The only other piece that was still under consideration, sorry I forgot the number, it is under section D, I'm sorry, it is under section A.

Mr. Coen: Oh yeah, A5.

Mrs. Baker: A5, Mike had just left it blank because there are so many pieces of that that come with the conservation assessment and the management plan that are on file. He was leaving it broad because we don't really have any, I know you all have had discussion on that, getting specific with each management plan. Basically, he took out the individual components to have one overall broad category.

Mr. O'Hara: I had a note down here that we were going to get zero points for no plan and five (5) for having a plan and then ten points for actually have followed the plan? You guys remember the same thing?

Mrs. Baker: So you say ten points for following the plan?

Mr. Coen: Ten points for having followed the plan and implementing.

Mrs. Baker: Five points for?

Mr. Coen: For having a plan.

Mrs. Clark: Which would be as it is stated right there, that would be your five points? Has on file?

Mrs. Baker: In that case, I think in the main statement we would say that the owner has on file and implemented and then we would break it out into implemented and on file.

Mr. O'Hara: So having it on file is a requirement? Having it on file with...

Mrs. Clark: Having it on file just to have it.

Mr. Adams: My view on that is, I have submitted for a nutrient management plan and what they do is all the technical information. They went into my manure pile, sampled it, and came back and said just like any other fertilizer, this is how much you ought to put per acre and there is tax credit for using certain equipment to spread this. Unless I go above a certain point there is nothing they can really do to make me do it in here and I find very few farmers, unless you're in a feedlot situation, there is really no need to have a nutrient management plan.

Mrs. Clark: And yet isn't that something that's going to be a big push? It's going to be a big push, which is what we talked about before.

Mr. O'Hara: The nutrient plan, is that the same as the quality conservation assessment?

Mrs. Clark: I think that's just a piece of it, isn't it?

Mr. Adams: Yes.

Mrs. Clark: Because the buffers around your pond and having livestock fence out of the pond, they're a bunch of components, isn't that right Jeff?

Mr. Adams: Yes.

Mr. O'Hara: Is there a reason not to have one?

Mrs. Baker: Technically, every farm in County is supposed to file one.

Mrs. Clark: However, if you don't take any money then there's no real reason to get it.

Mrs. Baker: We certainly don't have the staff to go out.

Mrs. Clark: And that's true because they certainly don't have the staff to do that. We had one done but that was like 35 years ago and we've never had updated.

Mr. Adams: Everything with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the soil and water, if you don't call them and ask for advice or ask for assistance you will never see them. They don't come out. It's not like anybody's going on a farm and inspecting anything, nothing like that happens.

Mr. O'Hara: Is there a cost to file one of these? I think we try to get down to whether it really needs to be filed or do they just need to show us that they have one and show us that they're following it.

Mr. Adams: It's an either or, if you wait for the government entity to review your plan there is no charge to you but in some areas where they're extremely backed up and hit her head against the wall, you pay a private consultant to do it for you but you don't have to pay the government.

Mr. Neuhard: Do you file a report with someone? Do you file the one that you've privately done with soil and water or some other agency?

Mr. Adams: I don't know. I have never gone that route so I don't know.

Mrs. Clark: Once again, if you need to get money from them then the answer is probably yes. Otherwise, how would we know?

Mr. Neuhard: But you still might be using that plan as your guidance document.

Mrs. Clark: That's true.

Mr. O'Hara: Just trying to get a sense of whether filing is necessary.

Mr. Neuhard: The question is how do we verify having a plan?

Mrs. Clark: If you have a private company assess this for you, you have paperwork that would have a nutrient management plan on it and suggestions on other things to do environmentally.

Mr. Neuhard: Okay, so how do you know if they're doing it?

Mrs. Clark: You walk out there and see if the pond is fenced off then you check that box, you have about running streams can be checked off.

Mr. O'Hara: So it's pretty easy to do a walk of the property?

Mrs. Clark: I would think if you have a nutrient plan that would be another piece of paper.

Mr. Neuhard: How do we know if it's appropriate to create a plan?

Mrs. Clark: You have to accept either soil or water's word for it or the consulting firm.

Mr. Coen: We can't say the word file because they don't really have to file it, I could have it be my guiding principle but if I am not asking for any money it doesn't have to go to any agency.

Mrs. Clark: Well, what you mean, because I don't even think you have to have it, it is called quality of the parcel.

Mr. Neuhard: This is another item that you all have identified to differentiate between the qualities of your properties. That is all you're using it for you don't have to have one but if someone has one, it is better to have one. So what we're trying to figure out is how to assess A) if they have one and B) if they implemented one. What would they prove to us if we were not evaluated, take your plan and go down the plan and look at all recommendations and go around and see if they put that in place.

Mrs. Clark: You could probably have soil and water or an extension person take that paper and go out.

Mr. Coen: With the five pointer, do we say have a plan prepared previously by x number of months before hand?

Mr. Adams: Here is the stuff that I am involved with, I will just say as a generalization, the county does not have the expertise to find all of these practices. The NRCS and soil and water do, so here is how you know whether a plan is implemented or not. I've got a contract with the USDA, they pay \$120 an acre to put down seed, fertilizer and my organic stuff. I only get paid once the NRCS comes out and says show us your seed bill, show us your fertilizer bill and show me where the grass is growing. So they come out and inspect it and says yes you implemented the plan. So if I had done the plan a year ago in October I would have gotten my money had I implemented the plan. When the drought hit this year and new established grass would die and all the nutrients would have gone but I did everything the plan said I was supposed to do. So because the government is paying you, they inspect everything and in some cases, I can show you the contract, that this is what I am supposed to do and I can show you a check that I got paid for Friday.

Mr. Coen: And that helps to get you ten points.

Mrs. Clark: If you just had an assessment done, you have to give some proof that you have had an assessment.

Mr. Coen: You want to say implemented, then have had an assessment done.

Mrs. Clark: Right.

Mrs. Clark: That could be either by soil and water or it could have been done by a private firm.

Mr. Coen: Okay. So the word wouldn't be filed, it would be having prepared an assessment. Does that make sense? The word filed doesn't make sense because you are not filing it anywhere. You don't have to.

Mrs. Clark: You might have.

Mr. Coen: Right, but if you have prepared an assessment...

Mr. O'Hara: Tom brought up something I wasn't even thinking about. How current it is? Does it really need to be done within the year? Is a plan created thirty-five (35) years ago current and accurate?

Mr. Coen: I was thinking on the other hand that, I know I have never filed one and I have never implemented one and I know I have never had one assessed but I want to get some type of points so two days before I file it I can go get an assessment.

Mr. Adams: No, because if you wait until two days before, it might take four months for the USDA to come out and look at you.

Mr. Coen: But I don't need the USDA, I just want my points. I just need to have a professional come out.

Mrs. Clark: But that's okay because what you are trying to say here is has this land owner done any work to see what would be best conservation wise? Even if it is done a month before they are applying or six weeks or two weeks, I don't think that matters because

they have done it. They have gotten the assessment done. Maybe it will get more people to do assessments.

Mr. Adams: We don't have industrial farms in this area like they do in other parts. Take for instance, the nutrient management plan, where it really comes in and says okay, your farm is sixty acres and you are producing eight million tons of manure. You don't have enough land to put that manure on so where is it going? See, that is why I do that nutrient management plan, I want to find out how close I was... Well I am nowhere near close but in a lot of parts of the country these farmers are having to truck manure hundreds of miles because they are not allowed to put their own manure on their own property. It is just way too much. We don't have confinement factory farms around here.

Mr. Coen: Okay, so are we alright with saying implemented, have a plan assessed or assessed plan? What word do you want?

Mrs. Baker: It is fine to say that the owner has prepared...

Mr. Adams: As a matter of fact, implemented may not be the right word in this regard because my plans, a lot of them are five to ten year plans. In other words, they realize that you can't do everything like I am talking about the pasture renovations. You can't have any animals on that land for a year. You never do your whole farm, you take the front and do that over a four or five year period. So it would not be fully implemented but you would have at least done a portion of it.

Mr. Coen: A portion would be implemented, right. So implemented would be a top category assess plan or an assessment, I am not sure what the verbiage.

Mr. O'Hara: Assessment completed.

Mrs. Clark: Right.

Mr. Coen: A completed assessment.

Mrs. Clark: Right.

Mr. Coen: Does that help you Kathy?

Mrs. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Okay.

Mrs. Clark: Where we have soil and water, I mean maybe what we need there is either soil and water or private firm.

Mr. Adams: It could be soil and water or it could be the NRCS or it could be a private firm.

Mr. O'Hara: Would we allow a self-assessment?

Mr. Coen: No. We would have to change where it said owner has it on file because there is no place to have it on file as required, so we will need to work on that.

Mr. O'Hara: A private third party should be a firm that specializes in that course of business.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. McClevey: I think we are in agreement that Tri-County should be involved, they should at least have it on their file saying they received this file.

Mrs. Clark: You know, there is nothing to keep people if they have gotten a private firm to do it from taking it down for a while.

Mr. McClevey: That is what I am saying. Why don't we have that standard? Why don't we say shall have or has on file a water quality conservation assessment no more than ten (10) years old so they could do it yesterday or they could have it for the next ten (10) years. And then property has implemented best management practices related to soil water conservation (i.e. buffers).

Mr. Coen: We should just say implemented the plan. The top category is they implemented the plan and this plan is on file. We are

going back to saying the plan... regardless the plan has to be on file with Tri-County.

Mr. McClevey: Right, but to get away from what Gail was suggesting so you can add it in there for thirty-five years or something like that. I would put a time frame on it if it is past five (5) or ten (10) years.

Mr. Adams: Most of the contracts are ten year contracts.

Mrs. Baker: The last question then is did you want to add "NRCS or comparable"?

Mrs. Clark: We could say soil and water or comparable plan.

Mr. Adams: I would put both because what happens is they all know each other and they play off of each other and they say we won't do this plan, we will let them do that plan because if we do it you only get fifty percent cost sharing but if they do it... So they do that one and we will do this one, they are playing a game with the farmers too.

Mr. McClevey: You mean Tri-County?

Mr. Adams: Yeah, Tri-County will refer you to NRCS and NRCS will refer you to Tri-County depending on the request.

Mr. Coen: So the owner has on file a soil water quality conservation assessment with the Tri-County soil water and/or NRCS and has the recommendations.

Mr. McClevey: Ten year.

Mr. Coen: Within ten year time period.

Mr. McClevey: No older than ten years.

Mr. Coen: Does that help?

Mrs. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Okay, the ten points goes to they have implemented said plan, five points if the plan is on file and no points for having none. Okay.

Mr. McClevey: That is a good start.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Is there any others?

Mrs. Baker: This is the last two pieces.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Anybody else have anything?

Mr. O'Hara: Any particular item?

Mr. Coen: Yep.

Mr. O'Hara: Anything, anything?

Mr. Coen: Anything, anything.

Mr. O'Hara: I guess the last time we talked about this was two or three months ago. You can take the criteria and kind of break it up into two. The criteria that speaks to quality and you have the criteria that speak to the threatening nature of the properties. The financial case for the program is getting the threatened properties because they are the ones that we're buying down the counties expense stream in perpetuity. That is where you get the real pay back, at least the way I look at the numbers, 160 of the points are about seventy-six (76) percent of the criteria in quality and only fifty (50) points and twenty-three (23) percent are in threatened. I guess in looking at supporting the PDR program from a financial case, I would like to see those numbers get a little closer to even. Now, Mike Lott, I brought this up and he sent me some information and I looked at some of the matching programs and I guess I really did not find a case that said you couldn't have a criteria or a higher ranking on the threatened side. The one I read, I think it



was the Virginia program, that the idea was that you were saving agricultural properties but it didn't say that you couldn't save agricultural properties that were most likely to be threatened. A lot of this goes back to the discussion where we pulled out the map and would we want to buy out the agricultural properties that were in... Development rights on properties that were in the development zone or do we want to concentrate on outside the development zone. That whole conversation along with the financial case for PDR comes back on the table because it is all expressed in the essence of the ranking system. I'm thinking more of a fifty-fifty split between quality of the properties and the threatened nature of the properties.

Mr. Coen: Okay.

Mrs. Clark: Except, I understand what you are saying, a lot of time, though, a property is threatened just because of the circumstances of the owner. If that makes sense? Now, at any time that you have reached the right kind of economic factors, that plan's going to go. Not necessarily because it is either in an Urban Development Area (UDA) or Ag area. Does that make sense?

Mr. O'Hara: Exactly, and we want to get those properties before they go because if they are... We only save money if they were going to be converted. I am trying to get more toward the high priority properties.

Mrs. Clark: We go back to how do you quantify this?

Mr. O'Hara: You know, I guess the point is we have limited resources and we sat here and talked about the rollback taxes and we were looking at a couple million dollars, probably best case per year but knowing that it is not exactly cheap. We have to try to make the best purchase decisions possible. How do we insure that through the ranking, because once you get past the ranking, the only other way to keep from buying up the wrong property is for the Board to reject all offers and they could take any offer that they want. So that is, I guess, the circuit breaker on the process but...

Mr. Adams: Threatened is one thing but if it is not quality farm land to start with, it might meet our definitions. It might be a 200 or 300 acre parcel but if it is poor quality of land nobody is going to be able to make a go of it farming anyway. That is land that is out to go.

Mrs. Clark: That is the whole thing, make it profitable and then we don't have this issue.

Mr. Coen: I guess it could be... Sort of, refresh my memory, is an A, are you putting all of that in quality?

Mr. O'Hara: Well, the only one that really talked about threatened was B.

Mrs. Clark: Which has some weird numbering in it to, if you look at B it has one, two, blank, three, four.

Mr. Coen: Yes. Technically under C2, that could fall under anything. "Proximity of parcel to other properties with PDR or other perpetual easements", so theoretically that could go either way. Those eight points could go to either category. Eight in theory could do two, you just have to have a contiguous parcel, it does not have to be farming or not farming. So two and eight, sorry two and four could go either way. One...

Mrs. Baker: Where are you?

Mr. Coen: I'm sorry, D1.

Mrs. Baker: That is the one with Environmental quality?

Mr. Coen: Right. Couldn't that apply to Harry the developers as much as it could apply to the farmer?

Mrs. Baker: That is not going to have any...

Mr. Coen: That is... the fourth one could go either way too. The parcel could go...

Mrs. Baker: Really, when you get into D and E, those are things that are adding value to the property.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. O'Hara: It still doesn't talk to threatened.

Mr. Coen: Right. I just want to say they could go either way or in either category. We have A that deals with seventy (70) points,

that is for quality and B is fifty (50) points and then you could sort of add C1 and C3. So ninety-four (94) versus fifty (50). It is almost two to one.

Mrs. Baker: Those are getting into your... you've titled that as your "Circumstances Supporting Agriculture.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mrs. Baker: So that is the only property that is next to a farm, as opposed to a property that is next to a strip mall.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mrs. Baker: And you could be favoring the agriculture because you are not competing with other interests who are going to have any impacts on the farms. You want a farm next to a farm, or in that general vicinity, because those are going to be your non-conflicting uses.

Mr. O'Hara: I really am interested in what your views are and how do we balance this to make sure that we can serve quality properties as well as we try to get the County to realize the savings that should come out of the purchase.

Mrs. Clark: Well, if you think that section B should have more weight, one of the things you could do is double all those and it becomes 100 points out of 270 or something, which does not bring us anywhere near close to fifty (50) but it does fix it a little bit. It would make it the heaviest weighted section.

Mr. Coen: I would say that it is really only B1 and B2 that could be doubled because the other ones are not really... The amount of contiguous road to the parcel doesn't necessarily mean it is threatened or not threatened, I don't think.

Mrs. Baker: Yeah, but it is going to be less threatened if you have road frontage because you will have limited developability of that parcel.

Mr. Coen: Right, okay. Leveraging... Would that... I mean, we could double one (1), two (2), three (3) and that would add another thirty (30) points, then you would have a ninety-four (94) versus eighty (80). Technically, four (4) could go either way "Landowners have agreed to any of the following restrictions". That wouldn't have to necessarily mean it was threatened or not threatened. A farmer could get that too. Or you could triple one (1) and three (3), I'm sorry, one (1) and four (4). One (1), two (2) and four (4) if you wanted too. That would make it ninety-four (94) versus 110.

Mrs. Baker: I am not catching where you are talking about.

Mr. Coen: We are looking at the B category.

Mrs. Baker: Right.

Mr. Coen: One (1), two (2) and three (3) are really are the only ones that really stick for something that is threatened.

Mr. Neuhard: Because four (4) helps prevent being threatened if you have those types of things...

Mr. Coen: Right and a farmer could get that as much as... That is sort of what the debate is, farmers versus something. So if you wanted to beef up... Right now it is ninety-four (94) points for agricultural/farming and only fifty (50) for threatened and even part of that fifty (50) could go either way.

Mrs. Baker: So that is why I am not following where you are getting the ninety-four (94).

Mr. Coen: Well, if you take the seventy (70) points that are in A, which primarily help agriculture, even take that to ten (10) points for size of the property. I am just adding, what I did was I took A because... Am I following where you were when you made your point.

Mr. O'Hara: Yeah, you are making adjustments for...

Mr. Coen: Okay, he was sort of saying you take A, all the agricultural type stuff and you put it together, it has, I forget what the number was but it has way more points for agriculture.

Mrs. Baker: I understand that but where are you getting ninety-four (94) points?

Mr. Coen: What I did was took the seventy (70) points from A, okay, and then I took twelve (12) points from C1 and I took twelve (12) points from C3.

Mr. Adams: Twenty-four (24) and seventy (70) is ninety-four (94).

Mr. Coen: Ninety-four (94), right. Makes sense?

Mr. Neuhard: Okay, so you are saying those are more favorable to agriculture?

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Neuhard: That is the point, okay. Then you went back and said one (1), two (2) and three (3) are most favorable to threatening?

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Neuhard: We want to try to balance this?

Mr. Coen: That's right.

Mr. Neuhard: That is what you want to do?

Mr. Coen: Right. If that is the premise that we would like to make it more equal, I was trying to figure out a way to make it more equal and Gail said we could just add ten (10) points and double all of B, but if you really look at B it doesn't really help threatened, it helps both. It is sort of like C, C can go either way on one (1) and two (2) and for that matter so can A. I mean, the size of the property could help a threatened property or a non-threatened property.

Mr. Neuhard: But two (2), three (3), four (4) and five (5) are definitely toward agriculture.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Neuhard: See, that is what you need to do is take that B and identify the ones that are most and then balance the two.

Mr. Coen: That is the goal.

Mrs. Baker: I mean, supporting agriculture but that is not under that category. I am not talking about the productivity capability of the property, which is all in the first five (5) under A.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mrs. Baker: C1 is again getting into your conflicting uses, non-conflicting uses, just because you have properties next door doesn't increase the productivity of your farm.

Mrs. Clark: Now I am going to add something else to the mix just as an FYI. If you increase those pieces that you are talking about and then we have all of D, which primarily, if you look at a property in Hartwood versus a property in White Oak or Widewater; a property in White Oak or Widewater is going to get many more points, usually, most properties would get more points than a property in Hartwood. We will never get anything saved in Hartwood now if we double those two because as far as that pressure goes, it might not... I don't know... I would love to see some of the farms saved.

Mr. O'Hara: So you're saying that you think D is really more heavily weighted?

Mrs. Clark: Right, where you have more waterways, more wetlands.

Mr. O'Hara: So we don't want to favor one over another, at least that is not my intent.

Mrs. Clark: And I may be wrong.

Mr. O'Hara: I think we want to be careful about that, that is the second criteria when we are looking at the points. I want to make

sure that we are getting the right properties and there are properties out in Hartwood that are probably just as good or better than properties over on the east side. You know if we look at the points by themselves, I mean all the categories, I think we come to a point where we all agree that the categories are worthwhile or else we would have dropped them after almost a year of working on this. Now it is trying to get the whole thing to work together so that we don't end up with a failed RP and we end up buying development rights on the right properties and we save money. This is more of "lets back up" and "big picture, what are we going to get out of this"?

Mr. Neuhard: Well, you know what you could do also is look at each one of these categories and say we want this percent, this percent and this percent and they either do it that way or go back and adjust your points so that it equals. I think that is what you need to do.

Mr. O'Hara